UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Kevin Reed,)	C/A No. 4:09-3126-JFA-TER
)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
Bob Olson, Food Service; Mr. McCall, Ward	len;)	
Mr. Kirsch, Food Service Branch;)	
Mr. Claytor; Acc. Warden: Ms. Cocciolone,)	
I.G.C.; Ofc. D. Lindsay; Ofc. Sewell; and)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

The *pro se* plaintiff, Kevin Reed, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging various violations of his constitutional rights with regard to prison food service, access to media, access to legal supplies, improper strip searches, and unconstitutional security detention.

The Magistrate Judge assigned to this action¹ has prepared a thorough Report and Recommendation and opines that the defendants' motion for summary judgment² should be granted. The Report sets forth in detail the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and the court incorporates such without a recitation.

¹ The Magistrate Judge's review is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

² An order was issued pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975) notifying plaintiff of the summary dismissal procedure and possible consequences if he failed to adequately respond to the motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff did not respond to the motion.

4:09-cv-03126-JFA Date Filed 02/24/11 Entry Number 89 Page 2 of 2

The plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report and

Recommendation, which was entered on the docket on January 19, 2011. However, the

plaintiff failed to file objections. In the absence of specific objections to the Report of the

Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the

recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

After carefully reviewing the applicable laws, the record in this case, and the Report

and Recommendation, this court finds the Magistrate Judge's recommendation fairly and

accurately summarizes the facts and applies the correct principles of law. The Report is

incorporated herein by reference.

Accordingly, the defendants' motion for summary judgment is granted. Plaintiff's

remaining motions are denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

February 24, 2011

Columbia, South Carolina

Joseph F. anderson, g.

Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.

United States District Judge